

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on November 17, 2005.

Claims 1-3, 7, 10, 12, 18, and 24 are amended; as a result, claims 1-26 are now pending in this application.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification because the Abstract contains extraneous information. It is believed that the amendment made herein to the Abstract obviates said objection and removes that extraneous information, which appeared through inadvertence and appeared as the certificate of mailing information. This has been removed by way of the amendment above and it is believed that this objection is no longer appropriate and should be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request an indication of the same.

Objection to the Claims

The Examiner objected to claim 10 due to informalities. The offending phrase that inadvertently appeared out of context within claim 10 has been removed by amendment as was suggested by the Examiner. Correspondingly, this objection is no longer appropriate and should be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request an indication of the same.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to remove the term “providing” and to add other language consistent with the claims as drafted. Therefore, Applicants believe this completely addresses the Examiner’s concerns and removes the present rejections with respect to claims 2 and 3. Applicants respectfully request an indication of the same.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kundu et al. (U.S. 6,510,398 B1). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an anticipation rejection

that each and every element or step in the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the cited reference.

With respect to amended independent claims 1, 12, 18, and 24 it is noted that there is no indication or suggestion of a teaching in Kundu where the testing is done for purposes of testing a cache page operation of a cache. Applicants noted in the original filed specification that full pin testing of devices under test were now being tested using software techniques rather than a full pin testing device. However, it was also specifically noted that these techniques failed to account for the practical problems associated with cache paging that generally is reflected with a bus transaction, which may be generated with a cache paging operation. It is this testing of a cache page scenario that Applicants' invention is designed to solve. The Kundu reference does not teach, address, or even suggest the testing of a cache paging operation. Accordingly, the rejections with respect to claims 1, 12, 18, and 24 should be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request an indication of the same.

With respect to amended independent claim 7, the results returned from the test now include a portion of the results that provides results for emulating a cache paging operation of a cache associated with the device under test. Similar to the discussion above with respect to amended independent claims 1, 12, 18, and 24; there is no teaching or suggestion in Kundu of an ability to emulate a cache paging operation for the device under test.

Accordingly, Kundu fails to teach or suggest each and every element or step of Applicants' amended independent claims. Thus, the anticipation rejections with respect to Kundu should be withdrawn and the claims of record allowed. Applicants respectfully request an indication of the same.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney, Joseph Mehrle ((513) 942-0224).

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

TAK M. MAK ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 349-9592

Date Feb. 17, 2006

By Ann M. McCrackin
Ann M. McCrackin
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 17th day of February 2006.

Chris Hammond

Name

Chris Hammond

Signature